arXiv:1603.09070v1 [math.CO] 30 Mar 2016

Complexity of equitable tree-coloring problems

Keaitsuda Maneeruk Nakprasit

Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, Khon Kaen University, 40002, Thailand

E-mail address: kmaneeruk@hotmail.com

Kittikorn Nakprasit *

Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, Khon Kaen University, 40002, Thailand

E-mail address: kitnak@hotmail.com

Abstract

A (q,t)-*tree-coloring* of a graph G is a q-coloring of vertices of G such that the subgraph induced by each color class is a forest of maximum degree at most t. A (q,∞)-*tree-coloring* of a graph G is a q-coloring of vertices of G such that the subgraph induced by each color class is a forest.

Wu, Zhang, and Li introduced the concept of *equitable* (q,t)-*tree-coloring* (respectively, *equitable* (q,∞)-*tree-coloring*) which is a (q,t)-tree-coloring (respectively, (q,∞)-tree-coloring) such that the sizes of any two color classes differ by at most one. Among other results, they obtained a sharp upper bound on the minimum p such that $K_{n,n}$ has an equitable $(q,1)$-tree-coloring for every $q \geq p$.

In this paper, we obtain a polynomial time criterion to decide if a complete bipartite graph has an equitable (q,t)-tree-coloring or an equitable (q,∞)-tree-coloring. Nevertheless, deciding if a graph G in general has an equitable (q,t)-tree-coloring or an equitable (q,∞)-tree-coloring is NP-complete.

1 Introduction

Throughout this paper, all graphs are finite, undirected, and simple. We use $V(G)$ and $E(G)$, respectively, to denote the vertex set and edge set of a graph G. Let $K_{m,n}$ be a complete bipartite graph in which partite set X has size m and partite set Y has size n.

An *equitable k-coloring* of a graph is a proper vertex k-coloring such that the sizes of every two color classes differ by at most 1.

Hajnal and Szemerédi [5] settled a conjecture of Erdős by proving that every graph G with maximum degree at most Δ has an equitable k-coloring for every $k \geq 1+\Delta$. This result is now known as Hajnal-Szemerédi Theorem. Later, Kierstead and Kostochka [6] gave a simpler proof of Hajnal-Szemerédi Theorem. The bound of the Hajnal-Szemerédi theorem is sharp, but it can be improved for some important classes of graphs. In fact, Chen, Lih, and Wu [1] put forth the following conjecture: Every connected graph G with maximum degree $\Delta \geq 2$ has an equitable coloring with Δ colors, except when G is a complete graph or an odd cycle or Δ is odd and $G = K_{\Delta,\Delta}$.

*Corresponding Author

Lih and Wu [9] proved the conjecture for bipartite graphs. Meyer [10] proved that every forest with maximum degree Δ has an equitable k-coloring for each $k \geq 1 + \lceil \Delta/2 \rceil$ colors. This result implies the conjecture holds for forests. Yap and Zhang [14] proved that the conjecture holds for outerplanar graphs. Later Kostochka [7] improved the result by proving that every outerplanar graph with maximum degree Δ has an equitable k-coloring for each $k \geq 1 + \lceil \Delta/2 \rceil$.

In [16], Zhang and Yap essentially proved the conjecture holds for planar graphs with maximum degree at least 13. Later Nakprasit [11] extended the result to all planar graphs with maximum degree at least 9. Some related results are about planar graphs without some restricted cycles [8, 12, 17].

Moreover, the conjecture has been confirmed for other classes of graphs, such as graphs with degree at most 3 [1, 2] and series-parallel graphs [15].

A (q,t)-*tree-coloring* of a graph G is a q-coloring of vertices of G such that the subgraph induced by each color class is a forest of maximum degree at most t. A (q,∞)-*tree-coloring* of a graph G is a q-coloring of vertices of G such that the subgraph induced by each color class is a forest.

In [3], Fan, Kierstead, Liu, Molla, Wu, and Zhang considered an equitable relaxed coloring. They proved that every graph with maximum degree Δ has an Δ-coloring such that each color class induces a graph with maximum degree at most one and the sized of any two color classes differ by at least one.

On the basis of the aforementioned research, Wu, Zhang, and Li [13] introduced the concept of *equitable* (q,t)-*tree-coloring* (respectively, *equitable* (q,∞)-*tree-coloring*) which is a (q,t)-tree-coloring (respectively, (q,∞)-tree-coloring) such that the sizes of any two color classes differ by at most one. Thus, the result of Fan, Kierstead, Liu, Molla, Wu, and Zhang can be restated that every graph with maximum degree Δ has an equitable $(\Delta,1)$-tree-coloring.

Among other results, Wu, Zhang, and Li [13] obtained a sharp upper bound on the minimum p such that $K_{n,n}$ has an equitable $(q,1)$-tree-coloring for every $q \geq p$. In this paper, we obtain a polynomial time criterion to decide if a complete bipartite graph has an equitable (q,t)-tree-coloring. Nevertheless, deciding if a graph G in general has an equitable (q,t)-tree-coloring is NP-complete.

2 (q,t)-tree-coloring on graphs

Assume G is a subgraph of H, and f is a coloring of H, we let f_G denote a coloring of G defined by $f_G(v) = f(v)$ for each vertex v in G.

Lemma 2.1. *Assume t in a positive integer. Let H be obtained from an n-vertex graph G and nt copies of K_{2q-1} by joining each vertex of G to t copies of K_{2q-1} where each copy of K_{2q-1} is joining to exactly one vertex of G. A graph G has a proper q-coloring if and only if H has a (q,t)-tree-coloring.*

Proof. Observe that each color class resulted from (q,∞)-tree-coloring of K_{2q} has size 2. Thus such a coloring is unique (up to isomorphism).

Necessity. Color G by a proper q-coloring. We can extend a (q,t)-tree-coloring to each copy of K_{2q-1} joining with a vertex in G by the above observation. Moreover, there is exactly one vertex in each copy of K_{2q-1} that has the same color with a vertex in G. Thus this coloring is a (q,t)-tree-coloring of H.

Sufficiency. Assume H has a (q,t)-tree-coloring f. By the above observation, each vertex v in G has exactly one adjacent vertex with the same color in each of t corresponding copies of K_{2q-1}. Consequently, v has no neighbors with the same color in G. Thus f_G is a proper q-coloring. □

Lemma 2.2. *A graph G has a proper q-coloring if and only if $H := G \vee K_q$ has a (q,∞)-tree-coloring.*

Proof. Necessity. Color G by a proper q-coloring. We can extend a (q,∞)-tree-coloring to H by coloring all vertices of K_q by distinct colors. One can check that each color class induces $K_{1,m}$ for some m. Thus we obtain a desired coloring.

Sufficiency. For a coloring f of H, define $S(f)$ to be a number of color classes V_is in which $V_i \cap V(G)$ is an independent set. Choose f among (q,∞)-tree-colorings of H with the largest $S(f)$. Note that if $S(f) = q$, then f_G is a proper q-coloring of G. Suppose to the contrary that $S(f) < q$. Then there is a color class V_1 such that $V_1 \cap V(G)$ is not independent. Note that V_1 cannot contain a vertex from K_q, otherwise V_1 induces a cycle subgraph. Since we color this K_q by $q-1$ remaining colors, there is a color class $V_2 = \{a,b\} \subseteq V(K_q)$.

Since V_1 induces a forest, we can partition V_1 into 2 independent sets X and Y. Let a coloring g be obtained from f by changing V_1 into $X \cup \{a\}$ and V_2 into $Y \cup \{b\}$ while other color classes remain the same. Thus we obtain a (q,∞)-tree-coloring g of H with $S(g) = S(f) + 1$. This contradiction completes the proof. □

Corollary 2.3. *Let $q \geq \max\{3,t\}$. The problems of determining if a graph G has a (q,t)-tree-coloring, a (q,∞)-tree-coloring, an equitable (q,t)-tree-coloring, or an equitable (q,∞)-tree-coloring are NP-complete.*

Proof. It is known [4] that determining if a planar graph G with maximum vertex degree 4 is 3-colorable is NP-complete. Thus deciding if $G \vee K_{q-3}$ is q-colorable where $q \geq 4$ is also NP-complete. Using Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2, we have that problems of determining if a graph has a (q,t)-tree-coloring or a (q,∞)-tree-coloring for $q \geq \max\{3,t\}$ are NP-complete.

Let H be obtained from an n-vertex graph G by adding qn isolated vertices. Then G has a (q,t)-tree-coloring (respectively, a (q,∞)-tree-coloring) if and only if H has an equitable (q,t)-tree-coloring (respectively, an equitable (q,∞)-tree-coloring). This completes the proof. □

3 (q,t)-tree-coloring on bipartite graphs

Let $V_1,\ldots,V_q$ be color classes from a q-coloring c (not needed to be proper) of $K_{m,n}$, $a = \lfloor (m+n)/q \rfloor$, and let

$$c(X_1) = \{V_i|\ |V_i \cap X| = a+1, |V_i \cap Y| = 0\}, \qquad c(X_2) = \{V_i|\ |V_i \cap X| = a, |V_i \cap Y| = 0\},$$
$$c(Y_1) = \{V_i|\ |V_i \cap Y| = a+1, |V_i \cap X| = 0\}, \qquad c(Y_2) = \{V_i|\ |V_i \cap Y| = a, |V_i \cap X| = 0\},$$
$$c(X_1') = \{V_i|\ |V_i \cap X| = a, |V_i \cap Y| = 1\}, \qquad c(X_2') = \{V_i|\ |V_i \cap X| = a-1, |V_i \cap Y| = 1\},$$
$$c(Y_1') = \{V_i|\ |V_i \cap Y| = a, |V_i \cap X| = 1\}, \qquad c(Y_2') = \{V_i|\ |V_i \cap Y| = a-1, |V_i \cap X| = 1\}.$$

We have the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $a = \lfloor (m+n)/q \rfloor$ and $m+n = qa+r$. There are nonnegative integers $k_1, \ldots, k_4$ satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned} k_1 + k_2 + k_3 + k_4 &= q, \\ k_1(a+1) + k_2 a &= m, \\ k_3(a+1) + k_4 a &= n \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

if and only if $K_{m,n}$ has a proper equitable q-coloring such that $|c(X_1)| = k_1, |c(X_2)| = k_2$, $|c(Y_1)| = k_3$, and $|c(Y_2)| = k_4$.

Additionally, we have $k_1 + k_3 = r$ and $k_2 + k_4 = q - r$ for the above values.

Proof. If c is a proper equitable q-coloring, then each color class is contained in X or Y and each has size a or $a+1$. Thus $|c(X_1)|+|c(X_2)|+|c(Y_1)|+|c(Y_2)| = q$, $|c(X_1)|(a+1)+|c(X_2)|a = m$, and $|c(Y_1)|(a+1) + |c(Y_2)|a = n$.

Conversely, assume nonnegative integers k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4 satisfy all of these equations. It is straightforward to construct a proper equitable q-coloring c with $|c(X_1)| = k_1, |c(X_2)| = k_2$, $|c(Y_1)| = k_3$, and $|c(Y_2)| = k_4$. Thus the converse holds.

Consider k_1, k_2, k_3, and k_4. From $qa + r = m + n = (k_1 + k_3)(a+1) + (k_2 + k_4)a = (k_1 + k_2 + k_3 + k_4)a + k_1 + k_3 = qa + (k_1 + k_3)$, we have $k_1 + k_3 = r$ and $k_2 + k_4 = q - r$. □

Let $a = \lfloor (m+n)/q \rfloor$. Each color class V_i from an equitable (q,a)-tree-coloring of $K_{m,n}$ has size a or $a+1$. Moreover, $|V_i \cap X| \leq 1$ or $|V_i \cap Y| \leq 1$, otherwise V_i induces a subgraph C_4. Using these facts, Wu, Zhang, and Li obtained the analogous result for an equitable (q,a)-tree-coloring.

Lemma 3.2. *[13] Let $a = \lfloor (m+n)/q \rfloor$ and $t \geq a$. There are nonnegative integers $k_1, \ldots, k_8$ satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned} k_1 + \cdots + k_8 &= q, \\ k_1(a+1) + k_2 a + k_5 a + k_6(a-1) + k_7 + k_8 &= m, \\ k_3(a+1) + k_4 a + k_7 a + k_8(a-1) + k_5 + k_6 &= n \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

if and only if $K_{m,n}$ has an equitable (q,t)-tree-coloring c such that $|c(X_1)| = k_1, |c(X_2)| = k_2$, $|c(Y_1)| = k_3, |c(Y_2)| = k_4$, $|c(X_1')| = k_5, |c(X_2')| = k_6$, $|c(Y_1')| = k_7$, and $|c(Y_2')| = k_8$.

Additionally, we have $k_1 + k_3 + k_5 + k_7 = r$ and $k_2 + k_4 + k_6 + k_8 = q - r$ for the above values.

Condition A. Let $m + n = qa + r$ where $0 \leq r \leq q-1$. We call (m,n) satisfies Condition (A) if one of the following holds;
(i) $r = 0$ and m is divisible by a,
(ii) $r \geq 1, r(a+1) \geq m$, and $\min\{\lceil m/(a+1) \rceil, q - r\} \geq (a+1)\lceil m/(a+1) \rceil - m$, or
(iii) $r \geq 1, r(a+1) < m$, and $\min\{r, q - \lceil (m-r)/a \rceil\} \geq a\lceil (m-r)/a \rceil + r - m$.

Theorem 3.3. *$K_{m,n}$ has a proper equitable q-coloring if and only if (m,n) or (n,m) satisfies Condition A.*

Proof. NECESSITY. Assume c is a proper equitable q-coloring of $K_{m,n}$. WLOG, assume $|c(X_1)| \geq |c(Y_1)|$. We prove that (m,n) satisfies Condition A.

CASE 1. $r = 0$. Then every color class has size a. Consequently, $|c(X_2)|a = m$. Thus (m, n) satisfies Condition A(i).

CASE 2. $r \geq 1$. Choose such a coloring c with largest $|c(X_1)|$. Suppose to the contrary that $|c(X_2)| \geq a + 1$ and $|c(Y_1)| \geq a$. Define $k_1 = |c(X_1)| + a, k_2 = |c(X_2)| - a - 1, k_3 = |c(Y_1)| - a, k_4 = |c(Y_2)| + a + 1$. By Theorem 3.1, there is a proper equitable q-coloring c' of $K_{m,n}$ with $|c'(X_1)| = |c(X_1)| + a$ which contradicts the choice of c. Thus $|c(X_2)| \leq a$ or $|c(Y_1)| \leq a - 1$.

SUBCASE 2.1. $|c(X_2)| \leq |c(Y_1)|$. Since $|c(X_1)|(a+1)+|c(X_2)|a = m$, we have $(|(c(X_1)|+|c(X_2)| - 1)(a + 1) \leq m \leq (|c(X_1)| + |c(X_2)|)(a + 1)$.

If $(|c(X_1)|+|c(X_2)|-1)(a+1) < m$, then $\lceil m/(a+1)\rceil = |c(X_1)|+|c(X_2)|$. Consequently, $\min\{\lceil m/(a+1)\rceil, q-r\} = \min\{|c(X_1)|+|c(X_2)|, |c(X_2)|+|c(Y_2)|\} \geq |c(X_2)| = (a+1)\lceil m/(a+1)\rceil - m$.

If $(|c(X_1)| + |c(X_2)| - 1)(a + 1) = m$, then $\min\{\lceil m/(a + 1)\rceil, q - r\} = \min\{|c(X_1)| + |c(X_2)| - 1, |c(X_2)| + |c(Y_2)|\} \geq 0 = (a+1)\lceil m/(a+1)\rceil - m$. Thus (m, n) satisfies Condition A(ii).

SUBCASE 2.2. $|c(X_2)| > |c(Y_1)|$. Then $|c(Y_1)| \leq a - 1$. Combining with $m - r = |c(X_1)|(a + 1) + |c(X_2)|a - (|c(X_1)| + |c(Y_1)|) = (|c(X_1)| + |c(X_2)|)a - |c(Y_1)|$, we have $\lceil (m - r)/a\rceil = |c(X_1)| + |c(X_2)|$. Consequently, $q - \lceil (m - r)/a\rceil = |c(X_1)| + |c(X_2)| + |c(Y_1)| + |c(Y_2)| - (|c(X_1)| + |c(X_2)|) = |c(Y_1)| + |c(Y_2)|$. Moreover, $a\lceil (m - r)/a\rceil - m + r = (|c(X_1)| + |c(X_2)|)a - |c(X_1)|(a + 1) - |c(X_2)|a + |c(X_1)| + |c(Y_1)| = |c(Y_1)|$.

Consequently, $\min\{r, q - \lceil (m - r)/a\rceil\} = \{|c(X_1)| + |c(Y_1)|, |c(Y_1)| + |c(Y_2)|\} \geq |c(Y_1)| = a\lceil (m - r)/a\rceil - m + r$. Thus (m, n) satisfies Condition A(iii).

SUFFICIENCY.

CASE 1. $r = 0$ and m is divisible by a. We can construct a proper equitable coloring c with $|c(X_1)| = m/a, |c(Y_1)| = n/a$, and $|c(X_2)| = |c(Y_2)| = 0$.

CASE 2. $r \geq 1, r(a + 1) \geq m$, and $\min\{\lceil m/(a + 1)\rceil, q - r\} \geq (a + 1)\lceil m/(a + 1)\rceil - m$.

Choose $k_1 = m - a\lceil m/(a+1)\rceil$, $k_2 = (a+1)\lceil m/(a+1)\rceil - m$, $k_3 = r + a\lceil m/(a+1)\rceil - m$, and $k_4 = m + q - r - (a + 1)\lceil m/(a + 1)\rceil$.

By assumption, $k_1 = \lceil m/(a + 1)\rceil - ((a + 1)\lceil m/(a + 1)\rceil - m) \geq 0$, $k_3 \geq m/(a + 1) + a\lceil m/(a + 1)\rceil - m \geq 0$, and $k_4 = (q - r) - ((a + 1)\lceil m/(a + 1)\rceil - m) \geq 0$. Obviously, k_2 is also nonnegative.

It is straightforward to check that equation system 1 in Lemma 3.1 is satisfied. Thus $K_{m,n}$ has a proper equitable q-coloring.

CASE 3. $r \geq 1, r(a + 1) < m$, and $\min\{r, q - \lceil (m - r)/a\rceil\} \geq a\lceil (m - r)/a\rceil + r - m$.

Choose $k_1 = m - a\lceil (m-r)/a\rceil$, $k_2 = (a+1)\lceil (m-r)/a\rceil - m$, $k_3 = r + a\lceil (m-r)/a\rceil - m$, and $k_4 = m + q - r - (a + 1)\lceil (m - r)/a\rceil$.

By assumption, $k_1 = r - (a\lceil (m - r)/a\rceil + r - m) \geq 0$, $k_2 \geq (a + 1)(m - r)/a - m = (m - r(a + 1))/a \geq 0$ and $k_4 = (q - \lceil (m - r)/a\rceil) - (a\lceil (m - r)/a\rceil + r - m) \geq 0$. Obviously, k_3 is also nonnegative.

It is straightforward to check that equation system 1 in Lemma 3.1 is satisfied. Thus $K_{m,n}$ has a proper equitable q-coloring. □

Condition B. Let $m + n = qa + r$ where $0 \leq r \leq q - 1$. We call (m, n) satisfies Condition B if one of the following holds;
(i) $r \geq 1, r(a + 1) \geq m$, and $q + a\lfloor m/(a + 1)\rfloor \geq m$,
(ii) $r = 0$ or $r \geq 1, r(a + 1) < m$, and $q + r + (a - 1)\lfloor (m - r)/a\rfloor \geq m$.

Theorem 3.4. *$K_{m,n}$ has an equitable (q,t)-tree-coloring if and only if (m,n) or (n,m) satisfies Condition A or B.*

Proof. SUFFICIENCY. Assume that (m,n) satisfies Condition B.

CASE 1. $r \geq 1, r(a+1) \geq m$ and $q + a\lfloor m/(a+1) \rfloor \geq m$.

Choose $k_1 = \lfloor m/(a+1) \rfloor$, $k_2 = k_5 = k_6 = 0$, $k_3 = \max\{0, r + a\lfloor m/(a+1) \rfloor - m\}$, $k_4 = q + a\lfloor m/(a+1) \rfloor - m - k_3$, $k_7 = r - \lfloor m/(a+1) \rfloor - k_3$, and $k_8 = m + k_3 - r - a\lfloor m/(a+1) \rfloor$.

By assumption, k_4 and k_7 are nonnegative. Obviously, each remaining k_i is nonnegative. It is straightforward to check that equation system 2 in Lemma 3.2 is satisfied. Thus $K_{m,n}$ has an equitable (q,t)-tree-coloring.

CASE 2. $r = 0$ and $q + (a-1)\lfloor (m-r)/a \rfloor \geq m$.

Choose $k_2 = \lfloor m/a \rfloor$, $k_4 = q + (a-1)\lfloor m/a \rfloor - m$, $k_8 = m - a\lfloor m/a \rfloor$, and $k_1 = k_3 = k_5 = k_6 = k_7 = 0$. By assumption, k_4 is nonnegative. Obviously, each remaining k_i is nonnegative. It is straightforward to check that equation system 2 in Lemma 3.2 is satisfied. Thus $K_{m,n}$ has an equitable (q,t)-tree-coloring.

CASE 3. $r \geq 1, r(a+1) < m$ and $q + r + (a-1)\lfloor (m-r)/a \rfloor \geq m$.

Choose $k_1 = r$, $k_2 = \lfloor (m-r)/a \rfloor - r$, $k_3 = k_5 = k_6 = k_7 = 0$, $k_4 = q + r + (a-1)\lfloor (m-r)/a \rfloor - m$ and $k_8 = m - r - a\lfloor (m-r)/a \rfloor$.

By assumption, k_2 and k_4 are nonnegative. Obviously, each remaining k_i is nonnegative. It is straightforward to check that equation system 2 in Lemma 3.2 is satisfied. Thus $K_{m,n}$ has an equitable (q,t)-tree-coloring.

Combining with Theorem 3.3, we complete the proof.

NECESSITY. Suppose $K_{m,n}$ has an equitable (q,t)-tree-coloring c. We prove that (m,n) or (n,m) satisfies Condition A or B. If c is an equitable q-coloring, then (m,n) or (n,m) satisfies Condition A. Assume equitable coloring does not exist for $K_{m,n}$. Consider equitable (q,t)-tree-colorings c of $K_{m,n}$. Define $k_1 = |c(X_1)|, k_2 = |c(X_2)|$, $k_3 = |c(Y_1)|, k_4 = |c(Y_2)|$, $k_5 = |c(X_1')|, k_6 = |c(X_2')|$, $k_7 = |c(Y_1')|$, and $k_8 = |c(Y_2')|$. We now restrict to c with the least $k_5 + k_6 + k_7 + k_8$.

We claim $|c(X_1')| + |c(X_2')| = 0$ or $|c(Y_1')| + |c(Y_2')| = 0$. Suppose to the contrary, let $b = \min\{1, |c(X_1')|\}$, $d = \min\{1, |c(Y_1')|\}$, and redefine $k_5 = |c(X_1')| - b, k_6 = |c(X_2')| + b - 1$, $k_7 = |c(Y_1')| - d$, and $k_8 = |c(Y_2')| + d - 1$. By Theorem 3.2, we have an equitable (q,t)-tree-colorings of $K_{m,n}$ with $|c(X_1')| + |c(X_2')| + |c(Y_1')| + |c(Y_2')| - 2$ defective color classes. This contradicts the choice of c. Thus the claim holds. WLOG, we assume $|c(X_1')| + |c(X_2')| = 0$ and choose such c with largest $|c(X_1)|$. Since c is not a proper coloring by assumption, we have $|c(Y_1')| + |c(Y_2')| \geq 1$.

CASE 1. $r \geq 1, r(a+1) \geq m$. If $|c(X_1)|(a+1) = m$, then we can obtain an equitable coloring easily. Thus $|c(X_1)|(a+1) < m$. Since $|c(X_1)|(a+1) + (|c(X_1')| + |c(Y_1)| + |c'(Y_1)|)(a+1) = r(a+1) \geq m$ and $|c(X_1')| = 0$, we have $|c(Y_1)| + |c'(Y_1)| \geq 1$ by condition of the case.

We claim $|c(X_2)| = 0$. Suppose to the contrary. Redefine $k_1 = |c(X_1)| + 1$ and $k_2 = |c(X_2)| - 1$. If $|c(Y_1')| \geq 1$, then redefine $k_4 = |c(Y_2)| + 1$, and $k_7 = |c(Y_1')| - 1$, otherwise redefine $k_3 = |c(Y_1)| - 1, k_4 = |c(Y_2)| + 2$, and $k_8 = |c(Y_2')| - 1$. We reach a contradiction by a smaller value of $k_5 + k_6 + k_7 + k_8$.

We claim further $|c(X_1)| = \lfloor m/(a+1) \rfloor$ or equivalently $m - |c(X_1)|(a+1) = |c'(Y_1)| + |c'(Y_2)| \leq a$. Suppose to the contrary. If $|c'(Y_1)| \geq 1$, then let $h = \min\{a, |c(Y_2')|\}$ and redefine $k_1 = |c(X_1)| + 1$, $k_3 = |c(Y_1)| + a - h, k_4 = |c(Y_2)| + h$, $k_7 = |c(Y_1')| - a + h - 1$, and $k_8 = |c(Y_2')| - h$, otherwise redefine $k_1 = |c(X_1)| + 1$, $k_3 = |c(Y_1)| - 1, k_4 = |c(Y_2)| + a + 1$, and $k_8 = |c(Y_2')| - a - 1$. Again, we reach a contradiction by a smaller value of $k_5 + k_6 + k_7 + k_8$.

From above, we have $m = |c(X_1)|(a+1) + |c(Y_1')| + |c(Y_2')| \leq |c(X_1)|(a+1) + q - |c(X_1)|$ $= a|c(X_1)| + q = a\lfloor (m/(a+1)) \rfloor + q$. Thus (m, n) satisfies Condition B.

CASE 2. $r = 0$. If $|c(X_2)|a = m$, then we can obtain an equitable coloring easily. Thus we assume m is not divisible by a.

We claim further $|c(X_2)| = \lfloor m/a \rfloor$ or equivalently $m - |c(X_2)|a = |c'(Y_2)| \leq a - 1$. Suppose to the contrary. Redefine $k_2 = |c(X_2)| + 1$, $k_4 = |c(Y_2)| + a - 1$, and $k_8 = |c(Y_2')| - a$. We reach a contradiction by a smaller value of $k_5 + k_6 + k_7 + k_8$.

From above, we have $q - \lfloor m/a \rfloor = q - |c(X_2)| = |c(Y_2)| + |c(Y_2')| \geq |c(Y_2')|m - \lfloor m/a \rfloor a$. That is $q + (a-1)\lfloor m/a \rfloor \geq m$. Thus (m, n) satisfies Condition B.

CASE 3. $r \geq 1$ and $r(a+1) < m$.

We claim that $m - |c(X_1)|(a+1) - |c(X_2)|a \leq a$. Suppose to the contrary. If $|c'(Y_1)| \geq 1$, then let $h = \min\{a+1, |c(Y_1')|\}$ and redefine $k_1 = |c(X_1)| + 1$, $k_3 = |c(Y_1)| + h - 1, k_4 = |c(Y_2)| + a - h + 1$, $k_7 = |c(Y_1')| - h$, and $k_8 = |c(Y_2')| + h - a - 1$, otherwise redefine $k_2 = |c(X_2)| + 1$, $k_4 = |c(Y_2)| + a - 1$, and $k_8 = |c(Y_2')| - a$. We reach a contradiction by a smaller value of $k_5 + k_6 + k_7 + k_8$.

We claim further that $|c(X_1)| = r$. Combining with the previous claim, we have $|c(X_2)| = \lfloor (m - r(a+1))/a \rfloor a$. Suppose to the contrary. Then $|c(Y_1)| + |c(Y_1')| \geq 1$. From $m - |c(X_1)|(a+1) - |c(X_2)|a \leq a$ and condition of the case, we have $|c(X_2)| \geq 1$. Since c is not a proper coloring by assumption, $|c(Y_1')| + |c(Y_2')| \geq 1$. Redefine $k_1 = |c(X_1)| + 1$ and $k_2 = |c(X_2)| - 1$. If $|c'(Y_1)| \geq 1$, then redefine $k_4 = |c(Y_2)| + 1$, and $k_7 = |c(Y_1')| - 1$, otherwise redefine $k_3 = |c(Y_1)| - 1$, $k_4 = |c(Y_2)| + 2$, and $k_8 = |c(Y_2')| - 1$.

Thus $m - |c(X_1)|(a+1) - |c(X_2)|a \leq m - r(a+1) - \lfloor (m - r(a+1))/a \rfloor a = |c(Y_1')| + |c(Y_2')|$ $\leq |c(Y_1)| + |c(Y_2)| + |c(Y_1')| + |c(Y_2')| = q - c(X_1) - c(X_2) = q - r - \lfloor (m - r(a+1))/a \rfloor$. That is $q + r + (a-1)\lfloor (m-r)/a \rfloor \geq m$. Thus (m, n) satisfies Condition B. □

References

[1] B.-L. Chen, K.-W. Lih, and P.-L. Wu, Equitable coloring and the maximum degree, *Europ. J. Combinatorics* 15(1994), 443–447.

[2] B. L. Chen and C. H. Yen, Equitable Δ-coloring of graphs, *Discrete Math.* 312(2012), 1512–1517.

[3] H. Fan, H. A. Kierstead, G. Z. Liu, T. Molla, J. L. Wu, and X. Zhang, A note on relaxed equitable coloring of graphs, *Inform. Process. Lett.* 111(2011), 1062–1066.

[4] M. R. Garey and D. S. Johnson, *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-completeness,* W. H. Freeman and Company, New York, 1979.

[5] A. Hajnal and E. Szemerédi, Proof of conjecture of Erdős, in: *Combinatorial Theory and its Applications, Vol. II* (P. Erdős, A. Rényi and V. T. Sós Editors), (North-Holland, 1970), 601–623.

[6] H. A. Kierstead and A. V. Kostochka, A short proof of the Hajnal-Szemerédi Theorem on equitable colouring, *Combin. Probab. Comput.* 17(2008), 265–270.

[7] A. V. Kostochka, Equitable colorings of outerplanar graphs, *Discrete Math.* 258(2002), 373–377.

[8] Q. Li and Y. Bu, Equitable list coloring of planar graphs without 4- and 6-cycles, *Discrete Math.* 309(2009), 280–287.

[9] K.-W. Lih and P.-L. Wu, On equitable coloring of bipartite graphs, *Discrete Math.* 151(1996), 155–160.

[10] W. Meyer, Equitable Coloring, *American Math. Monthly* 80(1973), 920–922.

[11] K. Nakprasit, Equitable colorings of planar graphs with maximum degree at least nine, *Discrete Math.* 312(2012), 1019–1024.

[12] K. Nakprasit and K. Nakprasit, Equitable colorings of planar graphs without short cycles, *Theoretical Computer Science* 465(2012) 21–27.

[13] J.-L. Wu, X. Zhang, and H.L. Li, Equitable vertex arboricity of graphs, *Discrete Math.* 313(2013), 2696–2701.

[14] H.-P. Yap and Y. Zhang, The equitable Δ-colouring conjecture holds for outerplanar graphs, *Bull. Inst. Math. Acad. Sin.* 25(1997), 143–149.

[15] X. Zhang and J.-L. Wu, On equitable and equitable list colorings of series-parallel graphs, *Discrete Math.* 311(2011) 800–803.

[16] Y. Zhang and H.-P. Yap, Equitable colourings of planar graphs, *J. Combin. Math. Combin. Comput.* 27(1998), 97–105.

[17] J. Zhu and Y. Bu, Equitable list colorings of planar graphs without short cycles, *Theoretical Computer Science* 407(2008), 21–28.